

New York Tribune

First and Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements

Published daily except on Sundays and public holidays.

MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1917

Entered and published daily in the Tribune Association, 100 North Broadway, New York, N. Y. Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Please send address changes to New York Tribune, 100 North Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Subscription rates: In Advance: One Year, \$10.00; Six Months, \$6.00; Three Months, \$3.50. Single Copies, 10 Cents. Foreign: One Year, \$15.00; Six Months, \$9.00; Three Months, \$5.00. Single Copies, 15 Cents. Canadian: One Year, \$12.00; Six Months, \$7.00; Three Months, \$4.00. Single Copies, 12 Cents.

Foreign Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, 100 North Broadway, New York, N. Y. Single Copies, 10 Cents. Foreign: One Year, \$15.00; Six Months, \$9.00; Three Months, \$5.00. Single Copies, 15 Cents. Canadian: One Year, \$12.00; Six Months, \$7.00; Three Months, \$4.00. Single Copies, 12 Cents.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in the TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Conscription at Last

April 28, 1917, will be remembered as the day on which the United States renounced for good and all a fundamental error in its military policy. The votes last Saturday in the two houses of Congress make it certain that we shall not depend again for the recruitment of armies on the unfair, haphazard, unscientific and extremely costly system of volunteering. We shall make military service an obligation of citizenship and shall mobilize by conscription the man power at our command, thus getting the best results not only in the field but in the industries by which our population must be fed and our armies supplied and equipped.

It has been an uphill fight to overcome the tradition of voluntarism. The idea that one may serve the state or not, as he pleases, had taken deep root in our easy-going American individualism. It fitted in with the loose structure of our national organization and with our frontiersman habits of thought. In young and sparsely settled countries volunteering is in harmony with the popular temper. That is why Canada and Australia have stuck to it in this war. But in a country which has attained, or is attaining, its growth, where economic and industrial conditions are complex, volunteering handicaps efficiency. It hampers national effort, because it prevents unification and scientific selection. It is a policy of muddling and waste.

Ancient prejudices die very hard. In spite of the warnings of military experts, in spite of the failure of volunteering in Great Britain and the vindication of conscription in the Continental countries, our people were slow to learn their lesson. Congress shut its eyes to the facts. It has refused for three years past to make any genuine military preparation. It scoffed at conscription. At the last session it was impossible to get action even on a universal military training bill.

But necessity is a great educator. What Congress would never have dreamed of doing two months ago it has done now. It has put our military system at last on a stable basis. It has now voted conscription by overwhelming majorities in both houses, not because the members like conscription any better than they did last winter, but because they have suddenly realized that without it there is no hope for us in a military sense.

There was a rush of Congressmen on Saturday to get under cover. The once formidable anti-conscription cabal melted away. The anti-preparedness machine, built up with so much care, went to smash. The Military Affairs Committee of the House, the chief agency there of mossbackism, had voted in favor of volunteering by 13 to 8. It was the decision of a packed court. The case for volunteering rested on cheap sentimentalism. It could not stand the test of argument. There could be no repetition of the exhibition of folly which passed the Hay law. In the House the volunteer scheme was therefore rejected on a first vote by 279 to 98 and on a second by 313 to 109. It was a crushing repudiation of the Military Affairs Committee clique. It ought to end the mischievous activities of that clique, to which the country owes so largely its present desperate condition of unpreparedness.

Despite that pacifist and anti-preparedness cabal and despite the apathy which so large a part of the public has shown toward rational military preparation, we are now headed toward the creation of a real army. That is the cheering thing about Saturday's vote. We have been late in repenting—but not too late. We shall now build up an adequate military system not only for this crisis but for the future.

While the country is congratulating itself on this result—attained with so much difficulty—it should remember with especial gratitude those whose devoted labors have had the largest influence in clearing the way for this indispensable military reform. It is not too much to say that Major General Emory Upton is the real father of the agitation to do away with the pernicious volunteer system. His book, "The Military Policy of the United States," contained an unanswerable indictment of voluntarism. It was left unfinished in manuscript on General Upton's death, in 1881, and lay for twenty years in the archives of the War Department. It was rescued from oblivion in 1904 by Secretary Root and printed as a public document. It became at once the starting point for the attack on the vicious volunteering policy which cost the United States so dearly in all its wars. Upton's brilliant critique shattered the delusion that volunteering had ever been anything but a calamitous experiment in our military history.

One other name stands out in the crusade now crowned with success. It is that of Major General Leonard Wood. More

conspicuously and efficiently than any other living officer he has worked for universal military training and service. He boldly preached the doctrine of conscription when few others had the courage to use that unpopular word. Public indifference never deterred or discouraged him. But for his breadth of vision, energy and fidelity American opinion might not even now have been educated up to the point of discarding volunteering as a broken staff. His name will be justly coupled with Upton's as a leader in the fight to destroy our most dangerous military delusion. Equally with Upton his place will be secure in the history of the modernization of the military system of the United States.

A Vote on the Sewage Bills

The Legislature is scheduled to adjourn this week. By one device and another a vote on Senator Wagner's bills intended to free the Croton watershed of state institutions and keep it free of them has been prevented. Unless these measures are passed there exists the possibility that this great city may be compelled to drink water mixed with the sewage from insane persons and defectives—a danger to which physicians and engineers are keenly alive and a menace which the public here dreads.

Senator Wagner's bills were introduced last year, but failed of passage. There should be no failure this year. They are too important to too many people to be jockeyed into failure again by parliamentary maneuvering. The opposition to them is political, based on the objection of Westchester County bosses to losing the institutions, with their jobs and contract patronage and their effect on property valuation, from the district.

That is a pretty small consideration to set against the health of a city containing half the population of the state. There are other sites in the state where there would be no possible menace to the health of any community. Other use, not detrimental to the health of this city's inhabitants, can be found for the present sites for the Mohansic Hospital and the Boys' Training School. All this is conceded by the state authorities, since the Governor has ordered construction work on these institutions stopped. But the metropolis cannot consider itself safe until these Wagner bills, legally putting an end to the menace, have been placed on the statute books.

The least the Legislature can do, surely the least it should do, is to permit a vote to be taken on these measures. The present tactics, which, if persisted in, must result in killing the bills by indirection, are anything but fair to this city. Those legislators who want to leave a possibility that New Yorkers may be forced to drink sewage-polluted water should not be excused from attesting that desire on a formal rollcall.

Getting Aid to the Farmers

Great stress has been laid by every government agency since the declaration of war on the necessity for raising bumper crops in order to feed ourselves and our allies. Indications of a willingness to respond have been gratifying. Everybody with available land, from professional farmers to commuters, women club members and children with plots in school gardens, has rallied to the call to be a "soldier of the soil." Two great items stand in the way of making this movement really effective—the difficulty of obtaining seeds or money for seeds, at present prices, and the scarcity of farm labor.

Many schemes have been suggested for meeting the scarcity of labor, including the drafting of men not fit for military service and the impressing of schoolboys. Boy Scouts and other potential labor boy not employed. It may be assumed that presently some government action will be taken to put seeds within the reach of the farmers or funds in farmers' hands to purchase seeds even at present prices, and to make available a supply of labor. But in the meantime no agency exists which can serve as a go-between for farmers and officialdom—which can correlate the needs of the farmers and the resources of the government to meet them. As the situation stands, farmers with available acreage, hitherto unworked for lack of sufficient capital or sufficient labor, must get into touch with county farm bureaus, with their state departments of agriculture or with the Federal department, and all this involves some uncertainty about the result and inevitable delay, while the planting season is at hand.

To supply the missing link in the chain, the Merchants' Association has evolved an excellent plan to be applied in the agricultural district tributary to New York City. At the request of its food problem committee, President Morgan has written to banks and trust companies throughout this state, New Jersey and Connecticut, urging the formation of local committees of bankers, farmers and business men. These committees are to learn the financial and labor needs of farmers and to tabulate them and communicate them to government agencies. They are to assure the farmers that financial aid will be forthcoming and that labor will be supplied, so that no time may be lost in putting under cultivation all workable land.

Such committees would have an important place in the campaign for intensive foodstuff production. A farmer in ploughing and planting time cannot indulge in extensive correspondence regarding funds for enlarging his work. But if he can go to some responsible representative of a local group of bankers and business men and get assurance of a loan to finance purchases of seeds and fertilizers, and file a request for a certain number of farm hands, with the certainty that his request will be honored when the aid is needed, he will have every inducement to keep every tillable acre busy.

President Wilson has said that "upon the farmers of this country in large measure rests the fate of the war." The farmers may be depended on to do their part, but the problem is bigger than that. This

suggestion for local committees to work with them and the government agencies is highly practical, in that it will enable the farmers to start their part of the work immediately, as is necessary.

German Threats of Repatriation

It was announced by the German government on January 31 that hospital ships crossing the English Channel were henceforth to be treated as ships of war and sunk without warning. This cowardly threat has been carried out with the utmost malignity, and only a few days ago a ship, with German as well as British wounded on board, was sent to the bottom. When the Germans learned that some of their own countrymen had fallen victims to their thoroughness they began at once to whine at the inhumanity of their enemies, and now, characteristically enough, the Minister of Marine announces that if German wounded continue to be transported in the hospital ships of the Allies it will be necessary "to adopt the severest measures in reprisal."

A more grossly perverse sense of justice has seldom been exhibited even by the Germans themselves. The pretext on which Germany initiated the war on the sick and wounded was that the enemy, and especially the British, had too many hospital ships and were undoubtedly using them to transport troops and military stores. Even supposing this were true, the remedy was simple, for under international law the Germans had a perfect right to stop and search any suspicious ship. The excuse for not doing so is that the Germans could not safely run the risk, and that hence it is abundantly reasonable to compel the British to establish hospitals for German prisoners in France.

Savagery, in short, is only reprehensible when a German suffers, and then the fault is with the enemy who fails to help Germany in directing it to the proper object.

Vox Populi

You can doubt democracy as a system of government with which to make war, but you cannot doubt the people themselves. That is the chief moral of political faith to which the war has thus far given birth. In France, in England and in the United States politicians and statesmen have shown themselves again and again hopelessly lacking in courage and in imagination. In each country the popular will has swept aside politicians and statesmen, got what it wanted, and what it wanted was right.

As pretty an illustration of the *vox populi* speaking its mind with courage and vigor as we have seen was the reply of Hamilton, Montana, to Miss Jeannette Rankin, Congresswoman-at-Large from that state. She had wired home: "I have heard of no one in the House who is supporting the President's conscription bill. Do you wish me to stand alone for this?" To which the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce made answer in words worthy of framing, to be hung before the eyes of legislators, male or female:

Hamilton overwhelmingly favors conscription as only fair method for democracy. Ask you and other Representatives of Montana to stand firmly by the President in his plans—if need be, alone.

If need be, alone! There is the courage which how many voices of legislators and statesmen have lacked in the past three years! And the Chamber of Commerce of Hamilton, Montana (population 2,240), bites out the words while you wait.

By a coincidence there were published in The Tribune on the same day the words of Joseph Chamberlain, written in 1898, to Dr. Morton Prince, of Boston. One striking passage in his extraordinarily interesting letter reads:

The statesmen whom Victor Hugo described ("un homme d'état c'est une certaine médiocrité supérieure") are timid. They will not "take offence by the hand"; but the people are all right, and, sooner or later, the *vox populi* will prevail.

The *vox populi* has prevailed; and in prevailing it has exhibited all the courage and all the imagination which contemporary statesmen have lacked.

Science and Statesmanship

Let us face the fact freely that eminence in scientific research does not of itself confer judgment in the conduct of life; but if it is conjoined with such judgment you get the most effective man of all, compared with whom the administrator who lives by picking other men's brains is helpless. He speaks with authority, and not as do the scribes. The true way of using the scientific men in business or official life is to staff the whole establishment with them and then to pick out for the direction those who develop talent for administration and judgment in affairs.

Singing "The Star-Spangled Banner"

To the Editor of The Tribune: Sir: I stopped at a recruiting stand at Fifth Avenue and Forty-second Street today to listen to a very able speech which a young man was making in an endeavor to stir the men to a sense of the duty which they owe their country. At the conclusion of his speech he asked the people (and there were a large number) to join in singing "The Star-Spangled Banner." He started the anthem twice, but no one joined him, and as he was not a singer he was compelled to stop, much to the apparent amusement of the crowd. Fortunately, a lady volunteered to lead the singing, and she sang one verse and the chorus, with perhaps half a dozen or a dozen people joining in, while it was necessary in several instances for the National Guardsmen who were at the stand to tell men (and probably citizens) to remove their hats.

I have never witnessed a more disgraceful scene. Such a thing would never have happened in any other country, especially at a time like this. Can you imagine a similar crowd of English or Canadian being asked to sing "God Save the King"? Every one would have sung it, and not been ashamed to do so, as apparently many people to-day were ashamed to sing America at war, and its citizens are asked to join in singing our national anthem, and they not only do not sing it or try to sing it, but seem to consider it quite a "joke" that no one could sing it.

It was not an ignorant crowd—there were rich and poor, a fairly representative crowd—but they were ignorant of their national anthem or else ashamed (which seems even worse) to sing it.

A WOMAN.

Yonkers, N. Y., April 24, 1917.

Send a Division to Belgium

[From The Tribune of March 24]

The very first step that should be taken by the United States Government, outside of the preparations for home defence, should be the dispatch of a division, drawn from our regular army, to Belgium.

It requires no argument to demonstrate that the issue which the invasion of Belgium raised in the paramount issue of the war, and that the principle involved is the principle at the root of the whole struggle.

To send a division of United States troops to Belgium, to serve alongside the Belgian troops in the defence of that tiny portion of Belgium still left to King Albert, and join with the Belgian troops in the reconquest of their homes, this is something that America should regard as a moral duty.

Whatever one may think of the other aims of the contending nations in Europe, the Belgian issue is unmistakable and the liberation of Belgium is the duty of the world.

By sending a division of regular troops to Belgium we should relieve a certain number of French troops now engaged with the Belgians. The troops which we send would pass through France, and their passing through France would be a sign and a symbol to the whole French people, first, that Americans were sending their sons to serve the same cause in Europe that French troops served in America nearly a century and a half ago, and, second, they would be a visible evidence of the arrival of a new force in the world struggle.

The Tribune agrees with its neighbor "The World" in its suggestion that we should give rather than lend money to France. But it feels that however great the sum of money we may give to France, if it were unaccompanied by American troops it would seem to a people spending their best blood in the service of civilization only a partial performance of our duty. It is not enough to pay in money, and we must share in the sacrifice of life essential to the salvation of civilization.

The Tribune believes that the United States should make all proper preparations for waging war, for contributing as an ally both in blood and treasure to the common cause of the nations now fighting against Germany. But it believes that German, and not American, purposes would be served if the declaration of war upon Germany should be followed by an interruption of that flow of supplies and munitions to Europe which, for France and for Russia, is almost indispensable.

One of the first things that the German influences in this country will attempt to do after war has been declared—and some of them have not waited the declaration—is to limit the participation of America to defence on this side of the Atlantic. Only secondary will be the attempt to persuade Congress to lay hands on all war materials in this country and turn them to the use of an American army which it will take long months and even years to create. If, following our declaration of war upon Germany, we should be beguiled into interrupting the flow of steel products and munitions to France, we should, in fact, have made the greatest possible contribution to Germany, and our entrance into the war might have a fatal meaning for those who are fighting our enemy.

We must send troops to Europe, because we must demonstrate our willingness to do our part and give of our lives as well as of our money. We shall have to send many thousands more of troops to Europe if the war continues for several years, as now seems likely; but this is a consideration of the future. At the moment it is of first importance that before we do anything we should coordinate our plans with those who are to be our allies, and we must avoid at all costs contributing to German victory by ignorant and stupid activities on our own part.

The Tribune believes that the division sent to Europe should be officered from our regular establishment; that it should possess the highest efficiency that can be obtained within that service; and it believes that a division of 20,000 men is the maximum possible contribution that can be made at this time in troops.

The Tribune heartily second the suggestion made by "The World" in the matter of giving financial aid to France, but it lays most stress of all upon the need of care and intelligence now, when it has become a material, as well as a moral, duty for us to aid the Allied cause, and a question of safety, as well as of honor, to defend civilization against the German attack.

The Backyard Gardener

[From The Detroit Journal]

That backyard gardener who says he has put forty dollars' worth of work into his patch and taken out ten dollars' worth of products is lost. He is betrayed by applying conventional business thought to an affair that should be as far from business as fishing for catfish is from making a real estate deal.

The least valuable thing that the amateur gardener gets out of his plot is vegetables. Infinitely more important is the exercise, the interest in growing things, the association with black soil, cutworms, mysterious fungus diseases and new forms of worry. The man who leaves a problem downtown and tackles another kind of problem back of the kitchen goes through a training in proportion. The man who flees from the irritation of competitors and tackles the competition of wet ground or neighbors' hens learns a fact of value to all men, that few things are acquired without a struggle. If in the sweat of your face shall thou eat bread, it is equally true that only through work and watchfulness shall you make a garden patch bring forth its increase.

Gardening is the thing, not the yield; clean, honest toil in the sweet open air, not the radishes and onions and tomatoes.

Austria and the Vatican

By a French Catholic

(Based on an Article in the Revue de Paris Signed "X")

One of the main fears of the Holy See since the very beginning of this war, a fear which influenced essentially its general political attitude during the last two and a half years, was the eventuality of a disruption of Austria. About the solicitude of the Vatican for the Hapsburg dynasty there can be no doubt. Many people are, therefore, inclined to assume that the "neutrality" of the Papacy has been and is partly yet but surface attitude. Others, placing the conflict between governments and dynasties, recall to their memory the policy of Leo XIII, who favored democratic ideas, was a sincere friend of the Slavic race, and, consequently, had conciliated himself with the thought of the eventual disappearance of the Court of Vienna. There are even some, particularly in Italy, who believe that the present Pope's anxiety about the fate of Charles I and his archduchess family can best be explained by Benedict's conviction of the identity of the interests of the Vatican and the Vienna Hofburg.

We are not unmindful of the fact that the Catholic Church has to look out for the future, even for the very distant future, and that in view of the certainty that there will be a new Austria after this war, the problem of how a great autocratic and strictly Catholic state could be tolerated in the centre of Europe is hard to reconcile with the present programme of the Entente, aiming at the reorganization of Europe on a progressive and democratic basis. This complex problem, therefore, deserves the most serious consideration on the part of the statesman and student of history.

Present Position of the Church

Let us, then, first, in order to obtain the right angle, consider impartially the position held in Austria-Hungary by the Catholic Church. The latter, to a certain extent and quite in dogmatic harmony with its claim to a supernatural origin, stands in Austria above the common law. The high clergy, constitutionally, is an essential part of the parliamentary and governmental machinery. Certain bishops and abbots enjoy not only nobiliary titles and all the privileges of the highest aristocracy, but also an enormous income from landed estates and other sources, reminding us of the great ecclesiastical feudal lords of the Middle Ages.

The lower clergy is respected and has a real political and social influence. Religious instruction is obligatory for the entire Catholic population. The world has not forgotten yet the splendors of the eucharistic congresses of a few years ago at Vienna and Agram, in which the court and the highest military and state dignitaries solemnly participated.

The Austrian Ambassador near the Vatican is the real dean of the Papal diplomatic corps in the Italian capital. From the moment the Austrian ambassadorial palace of the Piazza Venezia had to be vacated, the Vienna court missed no opportunity to redouble its regards toward the Papacy. Whenever Benedict XV raised his voice in behalf of a humanitarian principle, pleading for war prisoners, widows and orphans, or the saving of churches and their art treasures, the Vienna government was the first to heed the appeal in the most respectful manner.

The sense of relationship of the Austrian Catholics with the Pope is more individual, more filial, than that of the Catholics of Germany. At the Vienna Hofburg, even while the Triple Alliance lasted, one never took great pains to dissimulate the conviction that the so-called laws of guarantee of 1870, at present in full force and vigor, are not a sufficient safeguard for the absolute independence of the Holy See.

While the temporary pro-Papal manifestos of the Catholic centre in the land of Luther, Hegel and Bismarck quite naturally bear the stamp of more or less constraint, the clerical party in Austria openly and sincerely prays and works for the reestablishment of the temporal power of the Papacy.

Church and State

But in spite of all this we must not allow ourselves to be altogether deceived by the brilliant façade of the ecclesiastical Austrian state structure. In reality, the State rather than the Church is the winner. The opulence and political influence of the Austrian clergy are by no means conducive to the practice of Christian virtues. Has any one ever heard of a serious attempt on the part of the many multi-millionaire Austrian Church dignitaries to use their wealth and "pull" with their court and government to do some missionary work even in their own Balkan provinces?

They leave the work to the consuls, who never fail to inject the poison of politics into the food, in spite of the submarines, to the men who are fighting our fight.

If the war lasts beyond this summer it will be the American farmer who will win or lose the war, who will overcome militarism and autocracy or allow them, to spread and control the world, ourselves included.

This is no fanciful picture, but sober fact. Many a man will make light of it until he comes to think it over, but I venture to say that few will treat it lightly after careful thought. It is no more impossible than the great war itself appeared to be only a few days before it began.

It is true that we can greatly increase the available food supply out of grain now used in making liquors and by reducing household waste. But when these two things are done, and done thoroughly, they will not be enough. The final decision will still rest in the hands of the men who raise our food in the first place.

The clear duty of the nation is to guarantee the farmers a fair price for their crops when grown and a reasonable supply of labor at harvest. The clear duty of the farmer is to raise food enough to win this war for democracy against Kaiserism.

No such responsibility has ever rested on any class of men since the world began as rests to-day on the farmers of America.

GIFFORD PINCHOT.

Milford, Penn., April 28, 1917.

sacred task. Does the world know of one single Austrian prince-bishop or prince-archbishop who ever used his colossal revenues for the furtherance of some great religious, philanthropic or literary enterprise in behalf of his Church? In other words, the Austrian government simply uses its Catholic clergy as one of its most powerful political instruments. In Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia the priest is used to oppose the national aspirations of the Czechs, in Carniola to fight against the Liberal party, and in the Italian coastland against the "Irrredentists." Some even of the lower clergy have constitutionally the right to sit in the national assemblies, but they must not dare to take the floor against the government. Where the entire population is Catholic, at least no religious conflicts take place. But the demoralization sets in when the Greek Orthodox and other churches divide the field with Catholicism.

A Cowed Clergy

What is the consequence? Where the clergy is in the anti-national camp the younger generation considers religion as the arch-enemy of the nation. The present war brought the situation to a crisis. Anxious to avoid a fatal conflict, the Austro-Hungarian government dared not press the question of patriotism with the non-German populations. At the critical moment of the unleashing of the war dogs the state-pampered clergy had to submit to the behest of the government. The city and village priests, often against his convictions, had to preach "patriotic" sermons and spread calumnies and lies, thus often delivering innocent victims to the vengeance of civil tribunals and courts-martial. Woe to the person who had the courage to resist the commands or innocuities of his political chiefs! Let us not forget that even the Catholic feror of old Francis Joseph, who was raised by a pious Catholic mother of the old school, quickly took a back seat when the higher interests of the state stood in the way. He had at the time not only insisted upon using his veto power to prevent the promulgation of a law from occupying the Holy See, but did not even deign to answer Pope Pius X when the latter, during the critical July days of 1914, implored him not to project Europe into the bloody orgy.

Strange as the statement may seem to those who are not acquainted with the situation, it is nevertheless a fact that the Hapsburg dynasty, so far as their Catholicism is concerned, discloses a cynical pharisaism keeping pace with the fact that Francis Joseph, "the King of Jerusalem," had taken no pains to prevent his allies, the Sultan and the German war lord, from persecuting and annihilating the Catholics of Palestine and the Catholic Armenians. One million of Catholics, as duly baptized as the late Hapsburg monarch himself, have been assassinated with his connivance.

The question now arises how far the dissolution of this pseudo-Catholic-Austrian government is liable to react upon the future destinies of the Papacy.

Rome seems to feel the need of an Austria as her political pivot in Europe. But who cannot see the pitiable part the Hapsburg monarchy will, in all probability, be condemned to play, now that, with the victory of Russia, Germany and the war alliance of the United States with the Entente, the Central Powers are doomed to ignominious defeat? What chances of freedom would there remain for the Catholic Church in this polymorphous, half-ruined conglomeration of states?

Future Prospects

The friends of Austria in the Vatican contend that the Hapsburg monarchy, even if shorn off of the Italian "Irrredenta," Dalmatia, Bukovina, Transylvania and Eastern Galicia in order to satisfy the territorial ambitions of Italy, Serbia, Rumania and Russia, would still be a powerful state of nearly 40,000,000 inhabitants, and the Church does not hesitate to prefer this peaceful, homogeneous, Catholic "remnant" to the turbulent, heterogeneous and heterodox Austria in its present configuration.

In such a neutral state, having at last found its political equilibrium, the clergy, it is hoped, will no longer be used as a political cat's paw, and the Church will, for the first time in Austria's history, occupy a position of complete independence, so necessary for the realization of its mission.

To conclude: It is the Austria of the Catholic people and not the Austria of the court, with its double-headed eagle, which is worthy of the solicitude of the Vatican. Here Benedict XV has the chance to carry out the great favorite scheme of social salvation of his admired predecessor and master, Leo XIII. Anxious as the Holy See must be to maintain a big Catholic nucleus in the centre of the old continent, it should have no difficulty to see that the Allies have the right to say to Rome: "In nostro signo vinces" for the defeat of Austria connotes the victory of Rome.

Our Safety Against Invasion

It Depends Upon the Farmer, Who Alone Will Decide War

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In this great time, when every citizen must do his part, the President has made his chief appeal to the men who live on the land. He is right in doing so, for the safety of our country just now is in the hands of our farmers. What I mean is not merely our safety and the safety of our Allies in the matter of food. I mean that the safety of the United States against foreign invasion hangs on the decision of the farmers of the forty-eight states.

The two great weapons in this war are arms and starvation. The war against Germany will be won or lost in France; the war against starvation will be won or lost in America. The Kaiser cannot whip the French and English armies and the English navy while England has food. But it is still possible that the German submarines may be able to keep food enough from reaching England to starve her into submission.

If the submarines win, the first item in the Kaiser's terms of peace will be the English fleet. With the English fleet in his possession the Kaiser will be master of the world.

What will happen to us then? Every man who stops to think knows the answer. We shall have money, food, labor, land—everything that is desirable in the world except the power to protect what we have. Experts estimate that it will take us nine months to get ready to meet a German army of even 150,000 men, with modern artillery. Under such circumstances would the Germans treat us better than they have already treated Belgium and France?

Even if the armies of our allies should crush the German military power this summer, before the shortage of food can reach the point of want, the world would still need vast quantities of American food. But if they do not, only one course can make us safe, and that is to grow food enough on our farms for ourselves and our allies, and to put ships enough on the sea to carry the

The Reserve Corps Tangle

Department to Blame for Shabby Treatment of Candidates

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your excellent editorial headed "Where Tact Would Have Counted" you miss a very important point.

You say "it is encouraging to know that candidates for commissions who have passed their examinations are not to be subjected to additional tests," etc., etc.; "that those who have already qualified will receive commissions whether they enter the training camps or not."

The point is that the men who have been commissioned, or who have qualified for commissions, are supposedly better fitted for such positions of command than a new applicant for the camp without training. Yet many of them have but a theoretical training, and even those who have seen field service are far from trained officers, as judged by the regular military standards. The need of this "three months' training" in modern ways of warfare just as much as do the "rookies," and I even question if a better officer than some already commissioned.

As these reserve officers or prospective reserve officers who have qualified have been grounded in the elements of military science, is the government playing the game is not giving them an opportunity to perfect themselves by field training without calling on them for more "gratuitous services."

I myself served through the Spanish American War in Cuba, attended the Plattsburg camp, have successfully completed the winter courses prescribed by the War Department in the past two winters, and successfully passed my examinations for a commission over a month ago, and now have nothing to show for that effort. I have already sacrificed a great deal of time and money, financially, than I would receive in a year's pay in my rank, and yet the department now demands an additional three months' sacrifice.

There is no use in saying that we don't have to go to war, just as much as if we were drafted. We all know we need the training; we all know we will be penalized in competing with the men that are taken in; we all know we will be considered shirkers if we don't go. Yet those that are situated, as I am, with a dependent wife and children, have to take their means of support away to comply with such requirements.

Does such mismanagement breed patriotism? Does it make better Americans of our wives and children?

It is germane to this subject to call your attention to a provision that has always been a part of the General Staff's plan for the army. One of the first clauses has been: "Reorganization of the War Department." Until this reorganization occurs, until the department cleans house from top to bottom (and at present the top is a good place to commence), and a businesslike, thorough and efficient method of conducting the business of that department is devised, we will always have continual orders and plans of a like nature to this one of training officers.

A. B. P.

Islip, Long Island, April 28, 1917.

A Grave Injustice

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: If your article in yesterday's Tribune on the training camps for officers is authentic as to facts, a grave injustice will be done to many of the men who have spent the better part of the last two years in fighting themselves for commissions in the Officers